Paid and unpaid work

Barrère-Maurisson, M.A.

Publication date:
1995

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

WORC
Work and Organization Research Centre

[redacted]

R3
- unpaid work
- workers
- government policy
- division of labour
- families
- labour market

PAPER
PAPER
PAPER
PAPER
PAPER
PAPER
PAPER
PAPER
PAPER

Paid and unpaid work: The modes of societal *régulation*

Marie-Agnès Barrère-Maurisson

WORC PAPER 95.05.018/6

CNRS, SET-METIS, Paris 1

Paper written for the expert meeting on
Combining paid and unpaid work in families
May 29-31, 1995

This paper was written for the expert meeting on
Combining paid and unpaid work in families
May 29-31, 1995

Paid and unpaid work:
The modes of societal *régulation*

Marie-Agnès Barrère-Maurisson

WORC, Tilburg University, The Netherlands

Keywords: work, régulation, societal

Summary

Paid work and unpaid or domestic work are often analyzed separately. The former is primarily the province of those whose primary concern is the labour market or the organisation of firms, while the second is usually approached from the perspective of the family. However, work affects the family and the family affects work. Thus in order to take an holistic view of work, whether paid or unpaid, it is necessary to consider work and the family in conjunction with each other. This is the thrust of the approach we are putting forward here, which takes as its starting point the notion of the 'familial division of labour'.

We will start by attempting to demonstrate what this 'familial division of labour' consists of, particularly at the level of the firm. We will then analyze the phenomenon as it occurs in developed societies, focusing in particular on the emergence of specific forms of *régulation*[1]. This raises the question of the redefinition of the concept of work and the establishment of a new division of labour both within the family and within society.

New forms of *régulation* at the societal level do indeed seem to be emerging, depending on the role played by the family, the market and the state. These forms of *régulation*, which involve a complex set of interactions between the various institutions, vary from country to country and from period to period.

[1] Translator's note: translation of the French term régulation as used by certain French economists and other social scientists is problematic. It denotes the balance of social, institutional and economic forces that characterise at a particular time the economic system as a whole particular parts thereof. In the absence of any one English word that might adequately render this notion, and because to use the English term 'regulation' would be misleading in the context, the French word is retained throughout the English text.

Introduction

Paid work and domestic or 'unpaid' work are often analyzed as separate phenomena. The former is largely the province of those whose primary concern is the labour market, while the latter is usually approached from the perspective of the family. This is why, in addition to the division between the two aspects of work labelled respectively 'paid' and 'unpaid', we are faced with a division in the academic world between the world of work and that of the family.

This is as much a question of academic discipline as of field of research. Until now, for example, the various specialist branches of sociology (or economics) concerned with work or the family (cf. Blood and Wolfe, 1960; Becker, 1965 and 1981) have to a certain extent been reductionist constructions, since they generally reduce the second factor (work in the case of the sociology of the family, and the family in the case of the sociology of work) to a simple or exogenous variable which is examined in terms of its effects on the main focus of the discipline, work in one case, the family in the other.

However the two spheres overlap and impinge upon each other: families entail work, particularly domestic work, while the world of work is affected by the family (as is demonstrated by the flows of female workers with family responsibilities into and out of the labour market). Thus in order to take an holistic view of work, whether paid or unpaid, it is necessary to consider work and the family in conjunction with each other. To examine the relationship between work and the family is to consider individual actors as they function simultaneously in the two spheres. And to recognise this is to go beyond the compartmentalisation of academic approaches and disciplines and acknowledge the need to modify our theoretical constructs. These fragmented approaches have to be abandoned in favour of a holistic view of the actors. This is our purpose here, taking what we call 'the familial division of labour' (Barrère-Maurisson, 1992) as the starting point of a re-examination of the links between paid work and domestic work and of the process by which the division of labour is created.

Moreover, recent demographic changes, combined with changes in the family and in employment and work, are evidence of a shift in the relationships between the two spheres of the family and of work and require us to consider the existence of new relationships between

actors and institutions. These new relationships reflect new forms of accommodation between partners within the family. And at the level of the wider society, they reflect shifts in the balance of forces between the institutions that regulate work, employment and the family. Depending on the period and the country in question, three main forms of *régulation* can be discerned, in which the dominant forces are, respectively, the family, the market and the state. These three modes of *régulation* reflect recent changes in our societies, as well as the (permanent) tensions that exist between the family, the market and the state.

Thus we are going to start by showing how the 'familial division of labour' works, particularly at firm level, i.e. from a microsocial point of view. We shall then proceed to a series of societal comparisons in order to examine the forms it takes at the macrosocial level; such comparisons will reveal the emergence in the developed countries of new forms of *régulation*. As a result, it becomes necessary to redefine the notion of work and to consider the establishment of new forms of the division of labour, both between couples and in the wider society.

Finally, we shall investigate the role of public policy in managing the relationships between work and the family before highlighting the various forms of societal *régulation* in this area, which we describe, respectively, as familial, market and state.

1. Work and the family, or the 'familial division of labour'

'The familial division of labour is a process which, operating simultaneously in the labour market and in the family, distributes work in accordance with the family status of individuals' (Barrère-Maurisson, 1992, p. 243). Thus an individual's position in the labour market is linked to his or her position in the family and, more broadly, his or her participation in domestic work is linked to his or her participation in paid work.

1.1 Personnel planning at firm level and the family division of labour

Personnel planning at firm level is in fact based on the familial division of labour, with individuals appearing to be allocated to jobs in accordance with their marital status. Hence the argument that 'such and such a job is allocated to such and such an individual with precise familial characteristics' (Barrère-Maurisson, 1992, p. 46). In this way, personnel planning at

firm level helps to define types of family.

The surveys we have conducted in large firms have revealed the correlation between family type and career. More particularly, two typical situations were observed. The first is that of families in which there is no division of domestic work between the partners, and no sharing of paid work: in other words, only one of them 'works'. These are, therefore, families in which there is only a single career, but one that is very much oriented to promotion. This is the case with families in which the man holds a managerial position and the woman 'does not work' and is responsible for the home; this is also the case with single women in managerial positions. On the other hand, there are families in which there is a division of both domestic and paid work. Both partners are in employment but do not hold jobs with great opportunities for promotion (technicians or clerical staff).

There is also an intermediate position, described here as 'unequal distribution'. These are families in which both partners are employed but their careers are not considered of equal value. Either greater importance is attached to one career than to the other, or the man works full time while the woman works part time or discontinuously. The partner whose career is considered less important takes primary responsibility for the domestic sphere.

Thus there is a link between form of labour market participation and type of family. The logic that produces this linkage is based in part on the fact that firms' personnel planning policies make use of workers' familial characteristics.

For example, a firm seeks to recruit to managerial positions men who are mobile, i.e. men with non-working wives. This means that in this case the family is not only the consequence of a particular employment situation (involving long hours and a great deal of travel, with the wife acting, as it were, as the linchpin of the family), but is in fact the necessary condition for the man's career. In other words, a 'non-working' wife is a prerequisite of her husband's occupation.

Analyses of other employment situations could reveal similar phenomena in other categories. In all cases, however, the fact that firms exploit workers' familial characteristics reveals the existence of a whole apparatus of social and familial management that underpins the

management of work (career, mobility, etc.).

1.2 Labour force management: an economic as well a social and familial phenomenon

Here we touch upon the question - a very topical one in developed societies - of social management (rather than simply economic management) and thus of integration of the control exerted over the private and public spheres.

Firms intervene more or less explicitly in the management of the social and family spheres. Their intervention is explicit, for example, when manifested in the activities of works councils (social programmes, holidays for employees' children,etc.) or when conditions (relating to age, sex or family status) are attached to certain jobs. On the other hand, it is less explicit in the case of the so-called social surveys that are being conducted increasingly frequently by firms. These surveys are a double-edged weapon: on the one hand, they may very well provide assistance for families in temporary difficulty, but on the other hand they may rebound on workers if they are used, for example, to target populations who will be made to bear the brunt of redundancies or short-time working (particularly women whose husbands are employed in the same firm).

However, firms' 'family policies' are even more implicit when they help to shape family structures without any admission that this is happening, for example by ensuring that a woman remains single (because she has to be fully available to her employer if she has responsibilities) or that a man has to have a non-working wife, etc.

This combination of social and economic control is not unlike 19th century paternalism, the objective of which was not to intervene in the social sphere for the sake of doing good but because it was profitable to do so.

Ultimately, microsocial analysis of the 'familial division of labour' highlights, on the one hand, different family types corresponding to particular forms of the distribution of paid and unpaid work and, on the other, a correspondence between job and family status, i.e. a process leading to the creation of a specific division of labour.

2. Societal comparisons

This correspondence between family types and job types is also found at the macrosocial level, and particularly at that of the individual society considered in its entirety. As a result, it is possible to make societal comparisons which reveal the concrete forms taken by the process leading to the creation of the 'familial division of labour' in each society, i.e the forms taken by the social distribution of work, both paid and unpaid.

2.1 Making the comparison

Comparisons are possible because they are based on the overall coherence of the societal form rather than on its various elements considered in isolation. This overall coherence is derived in turn from a sort of *constant*, namely the set of principles underlying the link between work and the family. However, these principles differ from society to society, which is why it is possible to compare societies with each other, taking as a starting point an examination of the variation in the *societal* forms taken by that link.

This is the difference between the two methods known as 'cross-national research' (or the functionalist approach), on the one hand, and 'international comparative research' (or the societal approach), on the other (Grootings, 1986[2] and Maurice, 1989). The former is based on a term-for-term comparison of two or more societies: what is studied is the variation in the same element in several different national contexts, which gives rise to the notion of continuity between the phenomena. The latter, in contrast, seeks to understand 'sets of phenomena which, by virtue of their interdependence, constitute coherent national structures, specific to each country'. This is certainly the method of analysis that we are putting forward, one based on a comparison at the societal level of the forms taken by the relationship between work and the family, with these forms reflecting the overall coherence specific to each country.

The international comparisons that we have conducted have revealed that, in any given society, there is a correspondence between a dominant family form and economic characteristics. Thus it is possible to compare the societal forms (i.e at the level of each society, of each country considered in its entirety) taken by the relationship between work and the family, by the

[2] Cf. in particular chapter 8 and the diagram on p. 286.

'familial division of labour'. Each societal form constitutes a locally and historically specific form of the relationship, one that exists at a given moment and in a given socio-geographical space. Thus there is a correspondence between an 'historical' state of, for example the mode of régulation governing the labour market, and a specific configuration of family structures.

Such a comparison is conducted in three stages.

A. The construction of comparable data

The first of these three stages is to look beyond the incomparability of the various elements, restricted as they are by their national specificity, the product of, among other things, differences in the construction of concepts, categories and nomenclatures (Hantrais, 1989[3]). This requires the construction of new concepts and the break-up of categories.

After this, the necessary variables can be used to examine the linkage at the societal level between the world of work and that of the family. These may be quantitative variables, such as employment or demographic statistics, or qualitative variables, such as the provisions of certain legal or practical measures relating, for example, to forms of childcare, etc.

B. Understanding differences and similarities

Once the data to be compared have been rendered comparable, it becomes possible to look for possible similarities or divergences between the various phenomena observed.

If a qualitative approach is adopted, comparison may reveal the different role played by the same element in different countries. A quantitative approach may use classificatory methods or typologies, such as factor analyses. These will clearly reveal the relative positioning of the various elements. The configurations thus obtained will show the differences and similarities between variables and between countries.

C. Restoring coherence

Finally, in order to explain the resemblances and differences between the observed phenomena, they have to be relocated within the specificity of their national context. By returning to an

[3] Cf. in particular the contributions by Hantrais (Chapeter 2), Ledtablier (Chapter 4), Barrère-Maurison (Chapter 5).

examination of each phenomenon in its spatial and temporal context (i.e. within a social framework and as part of a national history), it becomes possible to highlight the specific logic of each one. In this way, the elements making up the particularity of the 'familial division of labour' in each society can be reconstructed; at the same time, the processes of change at work in the various countries can be placed alongside each other and compared.

2.2 A typology of national forms of the 'familial division of labour'

A factor analysis carried out in 1990 on 15 OECD countries (all EEC countries, except Luxembourg, plus Sweden, the USA, Canada and Japan), based on demographic and employment statistics, reveals a major distinction between Northern and Southern European countries (Barrère-Maurisson, 1992, Chapter 8[4]). This distinction represents in fact a time-lag in the emergence of changes, particularly demographic ones. The demographic changes that took place in Northern Europe during the 1960s appeared ten years later in the South (decline in birth and marriage rates, increase in divorce rates and in the number of single-parent families). However, the rate of change has not been the same everywhere, since the changes now affecting the South are proceeding more rapidly.

These sharp distinctions, of which the time lag in the emergence of demographic changes is one manifestation, are echoed in differences in national labour markets. As a result, the following general characteristics are to be observed. In the North (of Europe and America), demographic indicators (fertility) are showing an upward trend, with many families having broken up and been reconstituted; labour markets are characterised by very high female participation rates, equal to those for men, and a very high incidence of part-time work in the service sector. In the South, on the other hand, where fertility rates are still declining, families still tend to conform to the single-wage earner model, with low labour market participation rates for women, who tend to be either inactive or engaged in family work.

This is why, given the significance of the temporal component of change, we have described the latter group of countries as more 'traditional' and the Northern countries as more 'modern'.

---

[4] Eurostat data is more recent, but covers only countries of the European Union (see on this subject the work of Kempeneers and Lelièvre, 1991). Additional data on OECD countries, particularly on fertility rates, can be obtained from *Population et Sociétés*, which covers 'All the countries in the world' for 1991 and 1993.

Of course, even though the various countries can be ranked in terms of the chronology of change, this does not necessarily tell us anything about the nature or timing of future developments, since each country has its own pattern and pace of change, linked in part to the specificity of its economic, institutional and cultural characteristics.

In order to explain these major distinctions, we have attempted, taking selected countries as our starting point, to analyze in greater detail how overall societal coherence is produced in each country.

A. Extended families and low female participation rates in the 'traditional' countries

Spain, used here as a representative of Southern European countries, is a society in which female participation rate are still very low. Moreover, agriculture is still a very important sector of the national economy, in which many women work on a part-time basis. Often, however, they are working on family farms and are not paid. The dominant family forms are traditional ones, in so far as most of them have only one - male - breadwinner.

Generally speaking, married women with children who wish to work are confined to unskilled, often unofficial jobs. There is very little provision for the care of pre-school children; moreover, the majority of children do not start school until the age of five. As a result, the care of young children is largely the responsibility of their mothers; similarly, it is women who tend to have responsibility for looking after elderly family members, since retirement homes and the like are virtually non-existent.

Although it should not be forgotten that Spain is changing very rapidly, it is clear that in this case it is largely the family - and in particular the extended family - that shoulders the burden of responsibility for the domestic sphere. This is the result of the convergence of two types of phenomena: a lack of real jobs for women on the one hand and, on the other, a lack of provision, whether public or private, for the care of young children and the elderly (Barrère-Maurisson and Marchand, 1992).

B. High female participation rates and fragmented families in the 'modern' countries

Sweden is a good example of those Northern European countries that we shall describe here as 'modern'. Firstly, it is a country with very high female participation rates; they are virtually

equal to those for men, since 80% of women of working age are economically active. However, it is important to point out that Sweden, unlike most other European countries, has experienced what amounts virtually to a labour shortage. This is one of the reasons why a whole series of measures was developed in an attempt to encourage women into employment; these included fiscal measures relating to the taxation of households as well as legislation on the organisation of working time (Anxo and Daune-Richard, 1991).

Families in Sweden have specific characteristics. They have a relatively high number of children, and divorce is common; as a result, there are many single-parent families. This is why we describe the Swedish model of the family as 'fragmented', with households - frequently reconstituted families - tending to have two breadwinners. Nevertheless, couples do seem to share out tasks fairly evenly: fathers often modify their working lives to fit in which family life, with some men even working part time. There are indeed numerous opportunities for father to adjustment their working hours and to take parental leave.

Moreover, there is a sense of community at neighbourhood level that facilitates access to collective domestic services, and collective provision for the care of young children, the handicapped and the elderly seems both plentiful and well suited to people's needs.

Thus, as things currently stand, the organisation of working time, the public provision of social services, the distribution of tasks within the family and the existence of a highly developed service sector seem to indicate a high degree of *societal convergence* in the bearing of responsibility for the domestic sphere. In this respect, the existence of a service sector is a double asset: on the one hand, it employs a good deal of labour (albeit relatively unskilled and usually part time), while on the other it meets families' needs for domestic goods and services.

These examples show how the division between work and the family is organised in each country, how the 'familial division of labour' is produced at the societal level. However, a comparison across all the countries enables them to be located in relation to each other.

C. Countries compared

Countries can be classified according to their position in the process of historical change, the background against which changes in both the family and the economy take place.

Thus at the level of the family, we can observe a transition from a patriarchal form to a nuclear form (in which only the man does paid work), then to a family with two, unequal working partners (with the woman working part time) and now the two-earner family.

In the economic sphere, the process of change involved first a shift from agriculture towards manufacturing industry, and then from manufacturing to tertiary activities, based firstly on market services and then on an expanded public sector.

Thus it is possible to position countries in terms of the similarities between them at the level of the relationship between work and the family. By way of example, it can be observed that Germany and Japan both have economic structures based essentially on manufacturing industry and family structures based essentially on the single male breadwinner model. The United Kingdom has an economy in which the service sector is predominant and a society in which the dominant family form is one with two unequal working partners (most women being employed part time - cf. Barrère-Maurisson, Daune-Richard, Letablier, 1989), while France is positioned at the point where a tertiary sector based on an expanded public sector intersects with the two-earner model of the family.

Similarly, a predominantly agricultural economy is associated with patriarchal family structures. However, as soon as economic change leads to a shift from agriculture towards manufacturing - as in the case of Spain, for example - nuclear families begin to emerge. However, far from being reduced to a simplistic evolutionism, the processes that have been highlighted reveal both the multidimensional nature of the phenomenon (economic, legal, etc.) and the effects, both present and retrospective, of the various elements on each other. In no country does change follow a simple linear trajectory; there may be breaks, catching-up periods or periods of fluctuation, which do not necessarily exert the same effects in the world of work as in the family, since the histories of the two spheres are to a certain extent separate. Nevertheless, *'there could not be any economic change without a concomitant change in the family, and vice versa'* (Barrère-Maurisson, 1992, p. 236).

This might provide the beginning of an answer to one of the major questions about the evolution of our societies, namely whether change will be possible or impossible. It is often forgotten how economic change is linked to what is happening in the family and, conversely, that changes in

the family, the effects of which - particularly in demographic terms - are difficult to control, have an effect on the productive system and the working population of the future.

Nevertheless, the process by which the 'familial division of labour' is created operates at all levels of the social sphere: that of the individual, the group and the institution, as well as the nation. The division between work and the family that it sets in motion leads us to redefine the very notion of work.

3. Work and the distribution of work redefined

3.1 Work redefined

The close links between the world of work and the domestic sphere force us to reconsider the whole notion of work. This is clearly demonstrated by the example of transfers of skills between the two spheres.

A. Transfers between paid and unpaid work

Paid and unpaid work are juxtaposed, or even overlap, when they are both performed in the same place, as is the case in farming or artisanal families. However, the links persist even when the two worlds appear to be dissociated (Chabaud, Fougeyrollas and Sonthonnax, 1985).

This is usually the case with transfers of skills between the world of work and the domestic sphere, particular when women's work is involved.

Indeed, the skills required in many 'women's' jobs - i.e. those held by women - are closely linked to those required of them in the domestic sphere: dexterity, agility, accuracy, etc. (Guilbert, 1966). This is particularly true of female manual workers in manufacturing industry, where women's skills have often been acquired in the domestic sphere but are not recognised in the world of work (Kergoat, 1982). Similarly, many service-sector jobs are based on so-called feminine qualities which turn out to be nothing more than domestic attributes, particularly those expected of a housewife or hostess, such as accessibility and the ability to organise apparently discontinuous, superimposed tasks. These qualities, which are typical of the service relationship, are particularly suitable for secretarial jobs (Pinto, 1987) and those involving the

education of young children. In many cases, women's lack of vocational qualifications forces them into low-level jobs which are in fact merely an extension of domestic work (cleaning, child-minding).

Thus the qualities required for these jobs originate in the domestic sphere (and are genuine qualities - whether acquired or handed down - as studies by both ergonomists and sociologists have demonstrated [Haicault, 1986]) but are not recognised in the world of work, or rather are excluded from consideration as vocational qualifications.

The transfer of skills sometimes operates in the opposite direction, i.e. from the world of work to the domestic sphere. This is often the case with men in manual occupations, who become odd-jobmen or do-it-yourself enthusiasts when they ply their trades in the confines of their own homes. Transfer in this direction is less common among women, although it does exist: some secretaries, for example, do typing or administrative tasks for their husbands or other family members.

Behind this transfer of skills lies a transfer of work which *varies according to the time and place at which it is performed and is regarded according to circumstances as paid or unpaid.* This is the reason why it is impossible to separate paid from unpaid work.

B. This observation gives rise to the following definitions

1. 'Work [is] a single entity consisting of all paid and unpaid, or domestic work.' (Barrère-Maurisson, 1992, p. 116) Such a definition enables us to take account both of men's domestic work - and not simply of their paid work - and of all women's work, not simply that performed as part of their role within the family. It also marks a break with the traditional divisions of sociology, which has led to the sociology of work focusing primarily on men, leaving the sociology of the family as the only branch of the discipline to be really concerned with women.

Furthermore, this definition makes it possible to reincorporate the notion of work into the family. The productive system is no longer the only space in which work takes place: *the family*

has also to be taken into account (Chadeau and Fouquet, 1981)[5].

2. The family is a *'space in which work (both paid and unpaid) is distributed between men and women'* (Barrère-Maurisson, 1992, p. 132).

Thus the family is the unit through which the world of work and the domestic sphere are harmonised, the social institution through which work is regulated. In other words, the family is *'the space within which work is regulated* (work understood as a single entity comprising paid and unpaid work)' (Barrère-Maurisson, 1992, p. 132).

3.2 Towards a new division of labour?

The allocation of responsibility for the domestic sphere is a good basis for investigation of the forms taken by the distribution of work and thus of the division of labour.

Traditionally the responsibility of the family (as we saw, for example, in the case of Spain), the work produced in the domestic sphere seems gradually to have been transferred to other institutions, particularly in the service sector (as we noted was the case in Sweden). Thus the permanent integration of skilled women into the labour market has created a demand for domestic goods and services which are, in certain cases, a source of jobs for less highly skilled women. This is why this trend may lead to the emergence of a new division of labour, both in the family and in the wider society.

A. The new division of labour in the family and between women

All couples are faced with the question of how to allocate all the work required to maintain the family unit. There are various modes of distribution: one person, usually the man, may take sole responsibility for paid employment, with the other, usually the woman, doing the domestic work, or the work may be divided up, whether equally or otherwise.

As more and more women hold down high-level jobs, new modes of distribution are emerging.

---

[5] The time devoted to domestic work, although less in overall terms than that devoted to paid work, is nevertheless very considerable. In France in 1985-86, for example, women in employment spent as much time during the week on domestic work as on their jobs; men in employment spent less time on domestic work, but still devoted half the time they spent on their paid work to domestic tasks (Cf. Roy, 1989).

Thus some couples, both with very demanding jobs, will devote all their time to their careers, shifting responsibility for the domestic sphere to outside agencies. In other couples, on the other hand, the women will direct all their time and energies towards the domestic sphere, performing their own domestic tasks and being paid to do those of other women. Thus the domestic needs of some women have become a precondition for the survival of others.

Thus the transfer of responsibility for domestic tasks from the family to the service sector is in effect a transfer of work. For some families, *'domestic work'* is tending to disappear as it is externalised, so that the only 'work' that remains is that generated by the partners' careers. In other families, in contrast, the women 'work' only in the domestic sphere, both in their own families and outside, being paid to undertake domestic tasks for other families.

Thus the permanent interaction between the two aspects of work - the paid and the unpaid - is producing a new division of labour between women.

B. A new division of labour in society

This leads us to reflect on the emergence of a new mode of the distribution of work and tasks in society at large. In other words, the trend towards the transfer of domestic production from the family towards the service sector can also be interpreted as a *shift in the division between the domestic sphere and the world of work away from the couple and towards the wider society.*

This phenomenon is certainly a complex one, involving a wide range of different agencies. Responsibility for the domestic sphere may be allocated to a variety of different social actors: the family, firms, the state or the service sector. And, since the state in some countries is currently engaged in shifting that responsibility back to the family, we have to examine the complex relationships between these various agencies, even if that may in certain cases reveal tensions between those actors, as well as retrospective effects.

Thus the relationship between work and the family is essentially an economic and social issue, a question of the division of labour. It leads inevitably to the political and legal question of the relationships between the private and the public.

These examples illustrate the wide range of options available when it comes to allocating

responsibility for domestic and paid work, and the leading role played by such and such an institution at various times and in various countries. In one case it is the *family* and in the other the *state* that constitute, as it were, the two institutional poles between which the forms of social *régulation* have evolved in the recent past. There is no option but to note the development of the state pole (even though private forms of *régulation* are emerging) and thus the preeminent role played today by state policies.

4 The role of state policies in the régulation of work and the family

In some countries, at least, state policies would appear to have a relatively major impact on the accommodation between work and the family. In this connection, frequent mention is made of Sweden, which is held up as the 'model for the reconciliation of work and family life', if only because at the moment the demographic indicators in Sweden, particularly the fertility rate, are regaining some of their former dynamism.

The question raised by the problem of reconciling (or regulating) work and the family is that of the social order to which the policies being put in place will give rise. It is necessary, therefore, to investigate the impact of policies aimed at establishing a new division of labour, a new distribution of work in society, not only between the various institutions but also between the social categories.

4.1 Employment policy or family policy?

How can women's current aspirations to work, the expansion of employment and increases in the birth rate be reconciled? And over and above this question, the example of measures recently taken in France reveals all the complexity of the social issues in question, with any action aimed at one of the poles inevitably affecting the other. Employment policy and family policy are inextricably linked.

Various measures have recently been taken or proposed, first by employers and then by government. Thus insurance companies have put forward a programme for women with children that would have the added attraction of creating jobs. According to the proposal, women would have unpaid leave during the school holidays in order to look after their children; in exchange,

the companies undertake to reorganise their working practices and to take on young workers. Another company has introduced an 'annualized part-time agreement', whereby mothers would work half time and have Wednesdays and the shorter school holidays free but have their pay spread evenly throughout the year. In return, jobs would be freed for young people without children, who would be entitled to increased rates of pay but not to choose their work schedules.

The purpose of these measures is clearly twofold: on the one hand to make it easier to reconcile paid employment and family life, and on the other to create jobs. In other words, they are a product of both family and employment policy.

The recent law on the family (no. 94-629 of 25 July 1994) is part of the same process. It provides for the payment of the childraiser's allowance (*allocation parentale d'éducation*, or APE, which is roughly equal to half the minimum wage) to all women giving up their jobs under certain specified conditions. Here again, the purpose is twofold. On the one hand, the law is an attempt to increase the birth rate and make family life easier. On the other hand, it is also intended to alleviate the unemployment problem through the creation of new jobs, so-called 'family' jobs and service jobs (by developing care facilities for very young children, neighbourhood services, etc.).

The complexity of the phenomena is clear from the issues involved. The various objectives are sometimes difficult to reconcile (a reduction in unemployment and a rise in the birth rate may encourage women to return to the home, whereas the trend is towards increased female participation rates), and there is some degree of overlap or even confusion between the various policies being implemented. This is a clear demonstration, incidentally, of how demographic policy must take account of employment problems. Moreover, a number of different institutions may be involved in taking responsibility for both domestic work and paid employment, including families, firms and governments. However, while state policies are now tending to occupy a preeminent position, this has not always been the case.

4.2 Three modes of régulation: family, market and state

In order to understand the place of the various institutional actors on the social stage, we can turn once again to comparative analysis. This reveals the preeminent roles in the processes of

social régulation played by various institutions at various times and in various countries. The results of this analysis are presented in the synoptic table below, which depicts the various forms of societal *régulation* at work in our societies and the ways those forms have evolved. Inferred from the relationship that exists between the sphere of work and that of the family, they reveal the existence of three main forms of *régulation*, which we describe as *family, market* and *state* (see following table).

Work, family and forms of societal *régulation*

Variable				
economic sector	agriculture	industry	market services	public services
work	family	men, industry	women, market services	women, public services
type of family	patriarchal family	single wage-earner family	family with one main wage-earner	family with 2 wage-earners
domestic work	extended family	nuclear family	market services	collective services
	→ temporal/demographic axis			
regulatory agent	family	firm	market	state
mode of régulation	familial	market		state

A. The familial mode of *régulation* is exemplified in France by the period when agriculture was dominant and the patriarchal family was the unit of production. The lack of separation between work and the family meant that paid and unpaid work could be carried out within the family unit. The family was the agent and basic unit of social régulation, whose function it was to reproduce a private order at the level of society as a whole. And authority within the family was a reflection of authority in the wider society.

B. The market mode of *régulation* comprises two situations in which free-market notions predominate: the industrial model, in which private enterprise is the major element, and the tertiary or service model. The former is exemplified by the period during which industrial paternalism prevailed in France, while the latter is exemplified today by a country like the UK. In the first case, the firms that emerged during the process of industrialisation depended on the single wage-earner model of the family, in which the man's work was given priority. And it was the firm, taking its lead from paternalist doctrine, that virtually managed the family, just as it managed the work process. Later, as the service sector began to expand, women began to enter wage work in large numbers, often acting as secondary income earners. This gave rise to the two-wage earner family in which one partner, usually the man, was regarded as the principal breadwinner. Both these cases are examples of the market mode of *régulation*, which governs not only the employment relationship but also the allocation of responsibility for the family. Relationships between organisations in the labour market are regulated by competition, while childcare and domestic work, in the absence of any real family policy, are a purely private matter.

C. The state-dominated mode of *régulation* is the one that emerges in service economies with a large public sector; this more or less describes the case of France or Sweden today. It develops in societies in which women are firmly integrated into the labour market, in which frequently reconstituted families generally have two wage-earners and domestic work is shared when it is not handed over to collective, usually state-funded agencies. The state, through the family and employment policies it implements, is the principal actor in the process of social régulation. It actively intervenes in a number of different spheres, including private ones (Commaille, 1992); it manages and codifies work and the family through a wide variety of measures that determine who is integrated and who is excluded, who benefits and who does not. Institutions, particularly social institutions, play a dominant role. This is the model of the

welfare state (Schultheis, 1991).

These various modes of societal *régulation*, which characterise various distinct phases in France's historical development, also enable us to locate different societies relative to each other, taking their current 'stylised' state as a basis for comparison. In this respect, the three modes of *régulation* are to be considered as *ideal types*. In this sense, they are reductive, like any theoretical model. Reality is, of course, more complex, and only intermediate or even mixed forms actually exist. This is due in part to the fact that situations are never fixed but are constantly changing. Nevertheless, the modes of *régulation* outlined above, ideal types though they may be, have the advantage, in our view, of capturing the evolution of the social processes at work and highlighting the continuities and issues involved.

If an attempt were to be made to illustrate this table by providing examples of countries, the following configuration could be imagined. Spain represents the transition from the family model to the industrial market model, with Germany clearly representing this second model. The UK is fairly representative of the free-market service model, while France and, particularly, Sweden, represent the state model.

Although, within this framework, each mode of *régulation* has a corresponding dominant social actor, the main agent in the process of régulation, the various actors are of course present simultaneously. They interact with each other in a complex web of relationships that may be complementary or antagonistic depending on the situation or point in time. The childraiser's allowance in France is an example both of how firms can take measures to anticipate events and of how the state takes control of such measures. On the other hand, certain measures taken by the state - in respect of the care of elderly people, for example - would suggest that it is partially withdrawing from this area and returning responsibility to the family.

In other case, organisations and institutions may come into conflict with each other. Thus in countries like Germany, certain policies have had little impact in the face of a certain degree of cultural reserve, particularly as far as family and demographic policy is concerned (Barrère-Maurisson and Robert, 1994).

References

Anxo, D. and Daune-Richard, A.M. (1991). La place relative des hommes et des femmes sur le marché du travail - Une comparaison en France et en Suède. *Travail et Emploi*, 47: 63-78.

Archambault, E. (1985). Travail domestique et emploi tertiare: substitution ou complémentarité. *L'emploi dans le tertiaire, Economica*: 189-205.

Barrère-Maurisson, M.A. (1992). *La division familiale du travail - La vie en double*. PUF, 251 pp.

Barrère-Maurisson, M.A. (1994). Travail et famille - Pour une redéfinition du travail et de son partage. In: M. de Coster and F. Pichault (Eds.), *Traité de Sociologie du Travail*, Brussels, de Boeck, pp. 401-419.

Barrère-Maurisson, M.A., Daune-Richard, A.M. et Letablier, M.T. (1989). Le travail à temps partiel plus développé au Royaume-Uni qu'en France. *Economie et Statistique*, 220: 47-56.

Barrère-Maurisson, M.A. et Marchand, O. (1990). Structures familiales et marchés du travail dans les pays développés. *Economie et Statistique,* 235: 19-30.

Barrère-Maurisson, M.A. et Marchand, O. (1992). La prise en charge du domestique: comparaisons des liens entre structures familiales et marchés du travail dans les pays développés. Dans GREF (Edit.), *Familles et contextes sociaux - Les espaces et les temps de la diversité.*

Barrère-Maurisson, M.A. et Robert, G. (1994). *Métier et service public - France-Allemagne*, Paris, La Documentation Française, 145 p.

Becker, G. (1965). A theory of the allocation of time. *The Economic Journal*, 75: 493-517; and 1981, *A Treatise on the Family*, Harvard University Press.

Blood, R. and Wolfe, D.H. (1960). *Husbands and wives: the dynamics of married living*. The Free Press.

Chabaud, D., Fougeyrollas, D. et Sonthonnax, F. (1985). *Espace et temps du travail domestique*. Paris, Librairie des Méridiens, 156 p.

Chadeau, A. et Fouquet, A. (1981). Peut-on mesurer le travail domestique? *Economie et Statistique*, 136: 29-42.

Commaille, J. (1992). Conclusion. In: Haut Conseil de la Population et de la Famille, *Du politique et du social dans l'avenir de la famille, La Documentation Française*, pp. 219-

225.

Grootings, P. (Ed.). (1986). *Technology and work: East-West comparison.* Croom Helm, London, 304 p.

Guilbert, M. (1966). *Les fonctions des femmes dans l'industrie.* Paris, Mouton, 393 p.

Haicault, M. (1986). *Travailler à domicile.* 31 portraits, televised series, an INA-La SEPT production.

Hantrais, L. (Ed.). (1989) *Franco-British comparisons of Family and Employment careers.* Cross-National Research papers, Birmingham, 118 p.

Kempeeners, M. et Lelièvre, E. (1991). *Famille et emploi dans l'Europe des douze.* Commission of the European Communities.

Kergoat, D. (1982). *Les ouvrières.* Paris, Le Sycomore, 141 p.

(1994). Loi relative à la famille. *Liaisons Sociales,* 7080, 27 July.

Maurice, M. (1989). Méthode comparative et analyse sociétale. Les implications théoriques des comparaisons internationales. *Sociologie du Travail,* 2: 175-191.

Pinto, J. (1987). Le secrétariat, un métier très féminin. *Le Mouvement Social,* 140: 121-133.

(1991). Tous les pays du monde. *Population et Sociétés,* 259.

(1993). Tous les pays du monde. *Population et Sociétés,* 282.

Roy, C. (1989). La gestion du temps des hommes et des femmes, des actifs et des inactifs. *Economie et Statistique,* 223: 5-14.

Schultheis, F. (1991). La famille, le marché et l'Etat providence. In: F. de Singly and F. Schultheis, *Affaires de famille, Affaires d'Etat.* Editions de l'Est, pp. 33-42.

Work and Organization Research Centre
Warandelaan 2, P.O. Box 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg, The Netherlands